

**U.S. CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION (CODEL) WELDON
TO
RUSSIA, DEMOCRATIC PEOPLES' REPUBLIC OF KOREA, REPUBLIC OF
KOREA, PEOPLES' REPUBLIC OF CHINA, INDONESIA, AND JAPAN**

January 10-18, 2005

Overview

A bipartisan congressional delegation of six Members of the House of Representatives, led by Representative Curt Weldon, visited Khabarovsk, Russia; Pyongyang, Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea (DPRK); Seoul, Republic of Korea (ROK); Beijing, China; Medan, Indonesia; and Tokyo, Japan; January 10-18, 2005.

Delegation members included:

Representative Curt Weldon (R-PA)*
Representative Solomon Ortiz (D-TX)*
Representative Roscoe Bartlett (R-MD)
Representative Silvestre Reyes (D-TX)*
Representative Fred Upton (R-MI)
Representative Eliot Engel (D-NY)*

The delegation's primary objectives were to engage representatives of the North Korean, Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea government to strongly encourage their return to the six-party talks, to reinvigorate the negotiations to resolve the nuclear stalemate on the Korean Peninsula, and meet with executive and legislative representatives of the four other member nations participating in the six-party talks. Three rounds of six-party talks have been held, but none have been held since June 2004 because the DPRK has refused to rejoin the discussions.

The CODEL travel was in furtherance of its congressional oversight role and a longer term effort supporting the Administration's objective for a peaceful solution to the nuclear standoff on the Korean Peninsula. The delegation's bi-partisan effort had begun with a May-June 2003 visit to the DPRK and included four (*) of the six Members of this delegation. One result of that visit was the tabling of a discussion draft of agreed to common elements for a solution to the nuclear standoff: "Weldon Peace Initiative," attachment three. The 2003 visit was followed by meetings Chairman Weldon arranged in New York in 2003-4 with UN DPRK Ambassadors Park and Han; and conferences with other North Korean officials in 2004 at the University of Georgia and at the Capitol.

The delegation visited with senior legislative and executive branch officials, stopping in Pyongyang for three days and Khabarovsk, Seoul, Beijing, and Tokyo for one day each.

During each visit the delegation indicated its belief that sufficient agreement existed between the six parties involved to provide the basis for a settlement to the crisis and every effort needed to be exerted to reconvene the six-party talks. Chairman Weldon made clear President Bush's position of not seeking regime change or planning a preemptive attack on the DPRK. He also noted that the U.S. has demonstrated that it can work with countries it doesn't necessarily agree with on every issue, but the U.S. will continue to speak out for values it believes in related to human rights, the rule of law, peaceful relations with neighbors, and furthering the global war against terrorism. At the same time the DPRK has indicated its willingness, under the right circumstances, to rid itself of nuclear weapons capability. The delegation also discussed at each stop its desire for normalized relations with the DPRK so that initiatives could be undertaken in areas of agricultural development; cultural and educational development; defense and security; economic development; energy and natural resources; environment cooperation; health care; judicial and legal systems; local governments; science and technology; and space and aeronautics, similar to congressional initiatives undertaken with Russia, Ukraine and more recently Libya.

Also, during each visit, Chairman Weldon asked representatives of each country to consider participating in an informal conference of selected members of the parliaments of the countries participating in the six-party talks that would take place at Mt Diamond, DPRK, in the first quarter of 2005, to engage in informal dialogue in furtherance of a peaceful solution to the nuclear standoff. The North Koreans indicated their support for such a conference, but declined to commit to a date certain.

The delegation also took the opportunity to discuss regional energy issues in Khabarovsk; deliver 12,000 pounds of tsunami relief aid, including clothing, food, medicine, and medical equipment to Indonesia; visit with U.S. Forces personnel serving in Seoul and providing disaster relief in Indonesia; and address a conference at the Tokyo American Center sponsored by the Economic Research Institute for North Asia (ERINA). One full day, January 16, was dedicated to delivering humanitarian relief supplies to tsunami victims to Medan, Indonesia from Beijing.

Unlike the initial discussions during the May-June 2003 visit, discussions with DPRK representatives picked up where they had left off in June 2003 with very little hard-line rhetoric being part of official meetings. Chairman Weldon reiterated that the delegation was not visiting to negotiate issues with the DPRK or represent the President, but to engage in open dialogue on the issues as part of its congressional oversight responsibility and to "put a human face on America, with the ultimate goal of avoiding war." Discussions were extremely positive, with openness and candor displayed on both sides, with the opportunity being taken for ten hours of discussions with Vice Minister Kim Gye Gwan and a 90 minute substantive, unscripted, cordial meeting with the North Korean head of state, Kim Yong Nam, President of the Presidium, Supreme Peoples' Assembly. The meeting with the President was his first meeting with a U.S. congressional delegation. Visits were also made to Kim Il Sung University, the monument to the founding of the Peoples Workers' Party, the Pyongyang subway, Tong Il market, and the folk arts exhibition hall. The U.S. chief interpreter for Korea who

accompanied the delegation indicated it was the most candid and animated series of discussions on the substantive issues between the two countries he had ever been involved with in his seventeen trips to the DPRK.

The delegation stressed to the North Koreans that it felt time was not on its side -- that their launch of the Taepo Dong Missile in 1998 had played a role in expediting the deployment of the U.S. missile defense system, that the Pentagon was pressing for the development of a series of new weapons, including a "bunker buster" nuclear weapon for underground complexes, and legislation had been proposed in Congress that would preclude the President from providing aid to North Korea. The delegation also highlighted that major progress had been achieved at improving U.S. relations with Libya over the past year, demonstrating that the U.S. can reach accommodation with countries with whom it has strong differences.

Chairman Weldon also noted that Presidents Hu and Putin had called for denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. Further, he indicated the DPRK needs to understand that Japan is a close friend and ally of the U.S. and there must be an eventual resolution of the abductee issue.

DPRK officials indicated their decision to return to the six-party talks is one of timing. The officials want to see the final makeup of the Bush Administration's foreign policy team, and most important, wait to gage the rhetorical tone coming from Washington in Secretary-designee Rice's hearings, and the President's inaugural address and State of the Union speech. If the DPRK views the rhetoric as inflammatory, the delegation believes that there will be continued difficulties in getting the DPRK to return to the six-party talks.

DPRK officials:

Stated the DPRK had become a nuclear weapons State (a country that possesses nuclear weapons as opposed to a "nuclear deterrent" or "nuclear state") and as time passes, "our nuclear deterrent increases in both quality and quantity," but indicated "we do not intend to permanently keep them" (nuclear weapons);

Denied the existence of any uranium reprocessing capability; and

Declined to comment on the Japanese abductee issue.

In what the Associated Press called "a highly unusual overture," a statement issued by the state-run KCNA news agency the last day of the visit indicated "Pyongyang had appeared to soften its stance toward Washington...it was ready to become a friend of the U.S. and would be willing to resume six-party talks...the North Korea would opt to find a final solution to all outstanding issues between the two countries...if what the U.S. congressmen said would be formulated as policy of the second Bush Administration." (Translation of KCNA press release, attachment four.)

In discussions a day after leaving Pyongyang with the acting Foreign Minister in Beijing, the delegation was informed that the North Koreans had debriefed the Chinese on the delegation's trip, indicating the DPRK had viewed it as very positive. The Foreign Minister indicated that the trip had provided a historic opportunity for resolving the nuclear issues with the DPRK.

Strategic Context: The delegation's travel coincided with the continued engagement of 170,000 U.S. military personnel in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan; the two week period prior to elections in Iraq; the election of Mahmoud Abbas as President of the Palestinian Authority; and world mobilization to aid the countries of South Asia in the aftermath of the December 26, tsunami. The delegation's travel concluded two days prior to President Bush's inauguration.

North Korea/Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea

The delegation met with the DPRK principal negotiator for the six-party talks, Kim Gye Gwan, Vice Foreign Minister, for a period of ten hours over the three day visit. Four of the six member delegation had previously met with Minister Kim in a visit to the DPRK in mid-2003. The delegation also met with the DPRK head of state, KimYong Nam, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Peoples' Assembly. Other detailed discussions included the Foreign Minister and the senior military negotiator for Panmunjom, General Ri. Discussions with all representatives of the DPRK were extremely positive, with openness and candor displayed on both sides.

The Swedish Mission hosted a meeting with members of the European diplomatic community. Visits included Kim Il Sung University, the monument to the founding of the Peoples Workers' Party, the subway, Tong Il market, and the folk arts exhibition hall.

In leading off each discussion, Chairman Weldon reminded the DPRK representatives that it wasn't the traditional role of Members of Congress to represent the President or to negotiate on behalf of the President --

It is only the President or his designated representative, normally the Secretary of State, that can do that. In the American system of government, Congress is a separate, but equal branch of government...We are here to show the face of the people as representatives of the people of America to the leadership of the DPRK, and to make it clear that the American people do not want conflict and do not want war on the Korean Peninsula. Because we are Members of Congress we can approach DPRK leaders without the normal constraints placed on diplomats. We can say things they cannot say. We can provide insights that perhaps our diplomats cannot provide because our roles are different. As you know Congress controls the financing of the government and writes the laws that govern the conduct of U.S. foreign policy.

Further, in each discussion, Chairman Weldon made clear the desire of the President and Congress for a peaceful resolution of the nuclear crisis on the Peninsula and the desire of the U.S. to continue the six-party talks -- "to reinforce the fact that our President has stated publicly and privately that he does not seek regime change and that he will not preemptively attack the North."

Kim Gye Gwan, Vice Foreign Minister

Chairman Weldon opened the discussion by noting his favorable memories of the previous visit to Pyongyang in 2003 and the seniority of the current delegation -- with each Member being a subcommittee chairman or a ranking member of a subcommittee in Congress. He also commented on his first trip to Panmunjom, North Korea in the early 1990s, as part of a delegation that accepted the first remains of U.S. servicemen from the Korean War returned to the U.S. "Since then I have focused on your country so we don't

find ourselves in another war...I am here again to seek to find a way to avoid war and establish peaceful relations with our friends in the DPRK. As you know, there are some people in my country who don't want our delegation here. So, our task and my task has not been an easy one."

Chairman Weldon detailed his efforts since the 2003 trip to further U.S. executive branch consideration of options that could lead to a resolution of the stand-off, including discussions with Secretary Powell. He also indicated that the ten point initiative that had been developed between the delegation and Minister Kim in the 2003 visit, attachment three, had been posted on the State Department's web site.

We all have made many speeches regarding our earlier trip and have called for renewed six-party talks. I've traveled to New York to speak with Ambassadors Paek and Han. I've traveled to the University of Georgia to meet with your representatives there participating in a conference on Northeast Asia issues. Senator Biden and I hosted a conference with 400 people attending at the Capitol, that included Ambassadors Paek and Han, in which ways were discussed to get the six-party process moving.

Chairman Weldon also noted his efforts, along with Representatives Ortiz and Reyes, in the normalization efforts with Libya. Chairman Weldon noted: "Today, the U.S. trades with Libya and all this was achieved without regime change."

Chairman Weldon indicated he had kept his word in trying to find peaceful ways to establish relations with the DPRK, "Our colleagues in Washington are watching and listening to see what results from our trip here."

Chairman Weldon further indicated that he felt time was critical in satisfactorily solving the standoff with the DPRK: "Those critical of the DPRK are picking up support."

As an example, legislation was nearly passed in the last Congress that would have limited the President's ability to provide economic and other support to the DPRK. Others would like to push the President to take action that could lead to conflict with the DPRK, the last thing anyone of us here would want to see occur. Time is not on our side. In the past 18 months since our last visit, while we have been promoting peaceful efforts, others have promoted escalation -- and other actions against the DPRK in international agencies. The focus recently has been on Afghanistan and Iraq, with elections and a new president in Afghanistan and forthcoming elections and economic efforts to promote stability in Iraq. The focus will no doubt soon swing back to the DPRK. We want that focus to be positive, not negative. Many actions in the U.S. have been taken because of actions in the DPRK. The expedited deployment of a missile defense system in Alaska is in part due to DPRK's missile program. Further efforts are being proposed, like production of "bunker buster" weapons that could be used against deep underground complexes.

Our delegation represents both political parties. We don't want to speak of war, but want to discuss ways to work together for the benefits of our people -- develop plans for cooperation like we have done with Russia. Our President doesn't seek regime change in the DPRK. I've talked to him personally about this. There is no desire to preemptively attack the DPRK and the U.S. will certify that it has no wish to do so unless you attack your neighbors or our allies. The President has stated repeatedly that this is our policy. The President is willing to begin serious negotiations. We come in a spirit of friendship, not to make accusations, to work with you like we have with other countries that once were our enemies -- like Russia and Libya -- to improve the life of all our peoples.

Representative Ortiz highlighted the bi-partisan composition of the delegation, indicating "that sometimes we disagree on projects, but this is one we really care for and believe in." He also emphasized the importance of early action, as most successful efforts of a second administration are initiated in the first 100 days: "This is a time when they will lay out their agenda for the next four years. The atmosphere is right to arrive at a solution. We are here because we want to work with you to bring peace to the region."

Representative Upton, a member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, pointed out to Minister Kim that a provision in the energy bill for 2004 that failed to achieve final passage would have prohibited the President from providing assistance to the DPRK. Mr. Upton expressed his concern that "without positive movement toward resolving issues in the six-party talks by all parties, that this provision would likely be included in the energy bill in 2005. Therefore it is imperative that we bring back some positive indication of progress."

Minister Kim expressed appreciation to the delegation for its efforts since the 2003 visit and indicated it was evident the delegation was working very hard, with good intentions, to improve relations between the U.S. and the DPRK, with the ultimate aim of preventing war. He further indicated that a series of changes had been made since the delegation's 2003 visit, including much new construction and general revitalization of the economy, in preparation for the 60th anniversary of the Workers' Party of Korea and the liberation from Japanese occupation following World War II.

Another difference since your visit in May 2003 is that we have become a nuclear weapons state. This action was based on legal grounds by making public our withdrawal from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty on January 10, 2003. If Congressman Weldon had come here in September that year, we would have taken you to Yongpyon to assure transparency. We had thought it would have been helpful in finding a solution to the nuclear issue.

Minister Kim commented that the fissile material has been transferred from Yongpyon. "Thanks to President Bush, we are now a nuclear weapons state." He also noted that: "I would like to make clear that the nuclear deterrent is not aimed at the U.S."

It is only defensive in nature, to defend ourselves from nuclear attack. We made it because the United States first said it would attack us with nuclear weapons and it would beat us with a club.” He further commented, “under the right circumstance, the DPRK does not necessarily seek to preserve its nuclear capability for good.” Minister Kim indicated that he hoped this could be resolved in the coming year and that he believed the issue could be solved through dialogue:

Of paramount importance is how the Bush Administration establishes its policy toward the DPRK...To be frank, resolution could be simple if the Bush Administration abandons its policy to change the system we have and would indicate its willingness to coexist with us...It has been one and one-half years since your last visit, but not much progress has been made because of the policy of the Bush Administration. Its efforts are not in harmony with the efforts you are making. I remember your last visit and how you (Mr. Weldon) stayed up late one night, coming up with your 10 point plan to resolve the nuclear issue...I still have a feeling that hardliners are influencing the policies and don't have much interest in the initiatives in the 10 point plan. If your Congress is in fact a separate, but equal branch of government like you say, from this theory you should have impact on this (hard-line) policy and implementation of (a more positive) policy.

With regard to the six-party talks, Minister Kim commented “that the foundation is destroyed.”

There is no justification to be at the six-party talks. All the parties had agreed upon the principle “word for word,” “action for action.” However, since the June 2004 meeting finished, the U.S. delegation has said we should give up our nuclear program and the U.S. would think about what to do next. Technically the DPRK and the U.S. are at war. We cannot accept the demand to lay down our arms first. While the U.S. agreed to “actions for actions, the U.S. has asked the DPRK to move first -- this destroys the basic agreement we had made at the six-party talks. We believe that the only way that we can prevent war in this circumstance is to have a capable deterrence...All agreed for the 4th round last September. However, as soon as the third round was over the U.S. delegation turned down everything it had said and assumed a hostile policy, saying it intended to invade our country. We would like the Administration to make clear whether there is any intent to change its policy on the DPRK. We will follow closely the State of the Union address and watch closely the appointments of top officials of the second Bush term and judge the likely policy of Administration.

I heard you say that Bush doesn't seek regime change and has no intent to have preemptive attack, with no intent to that end and intends for serious discussions. We would like to see that illustrated as policy toward the

DPRK, whether these elements are included -- drawn as official policy in a second Bush term.

As for the idea of a joint conference to be launched by six-party parliaments at Mount Keum Kang, we will deliver that suggestion to our Supreme Peoples' Assembly. I would like to say one thing regarding the feeling of our National Assembly -- that they are not at all happy with the U.S. Congress passage of the North Korean Human Rights Act. I am not happy with the passage of this Act.

In responding to concerns raised by Chairman Weldon that there could be a provision in the energy bill that could block aid to the DPRK, Minister Kim commented: "this is something the U.S. has to decide."

However, I would like to make clear that we will not attend the six-party talks if we are pressured by someone. The six-party talks were initiated by my country. The U.S. wanted to have five party talks. Our goal in the six-party talks is to resolve the nuclear issues as soon as possible and make the Korean Peninsula nuclear free. Six-party talks could help early resolution of the nuclear issue and denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. As a small nation, historically surrounded by big powers, we have great pride and value our independence and value that as our own life. We would rather die than lose our independence.

The Bush Administration does not have a sound policy because it rejects our philosophy and social system -- and seeks regime change in our country. This kind of policy is due to the hardliners -- who have no knowledge of my country. Maybe the Administration thought that by exerting pressure we would react like eastern European nations. By experiencing economic difficulties it was thought we would collapse with pressure. You see that this is not feasible by your stay in our country. I think that getting to know and understand one another better is key to solving our problems. As for relations with the U.S., we would like to improve our relations. But we would like our social system to remain as it is. We don't want to remain as enemies for the next 100 years as we have the past 100 years. There is no reason to repeat the past. The U.S. needs to refrain from slandering our country. We will respect the U.S. and refrain from saying hateful things of the U.S. At least between you (Mr. Weldon) and your colleagues we have reached a common understanding in many forward and positive ways. Based on those common grounds we can plan for the future.

Chairman Weldon indicated that although it may not seem like much has happened since the delegation's meeting with Minister Kim 18 months previously, that much discussion had taken place with the DPRK UN Ambassadors in New York, in

seminars, with the U.S. media, and in the halls of Congress with regard to the need for dialogue to resolve the differences with the DPRK.

Minister Kim indicated that the DPRK will be looking and watching very carefully to see what kind of policy the Bush Administration will come forward with -- whether it will be a sound policy on the DPRK. "If it is not the proper policy, all your efforts at goodwill will not work."

Last year (May 03) you urged our participation in the six-party talks. We wanted bilateral discussions. At that time, our country was insisting on a bilateral format. However we took consideration of your advice and other friends on multilateral talks. At that time we also had expectations of bilateral talks as part of the six-party discussions...In the first round in August, 2003, we had a brief conversation for 15 minutes in the corner of a large conference room -- that was the extent of the bilateral discussions...There is no need for me to point out the (lack of) progress from that kind of setup. The second round was in February, 2004 and the 3rd in June, 2004. We had bilateral (discussions) in a separate room, yet the first word from the U.S. delegation was that the meeting was just to exchange views, not to negotiate. Do you think the issue would be resolved in this fashion?...I really don't think such meetings can lead to substantive results...We wanted a non-aggression treaty. The U.S. side said such a treaty would not be passed by Congress...The U.S. side this would be possible only if the DPRK would give up its nuclear programs. At the talks we told the U.S. we could freeze our nuclear activities and we told the U.S. side that there should be economic compensation for such a freeze. China, Russia, South Korea and even Japan have wanted to join that kind of reward. The U.S. declined to respond because it didn't buy our nuclear proposal. We said ok, if you are not willing, we will move on our own way. You know full well that making nuclear deterrent doesn't take that much time. Last July we were urged to rejoin talks in September. However, the U.S. repeated the same line...Our nuclear deterrent originated because of a hostile U.S. policy pursued by the Administration of the U.S. Abandon the hostile policy, then the nuclear issue will be resolved.

Then the PSI (Proliferation Security Initiative) was launched. An exercise took place in the Sea of Japan. Some people said the PSI was not aimed at the DPRK. However, Secretary Bolton made clear that this exercise was aimed at the DPRK.

You congressman then passed the so-called North Korean Human Rights Act -- the real purpose of which was to encourage people to leave our country and lead to the eventual collapse of our system...NGOs are trying to encourage our people to come over to China so they can flee our country. Strictly speaking there are no refugees. In fact these people are not defectors, only those that crossed illegally. These people have gone across the

border to look for food or visit relatives. However they tried to seduce our people with money, trying to lead our people to defect.

The U.S. is putting \$11 billion worth of new equipment to improve U.S. forces in South Korea. However, we have heard that the reduction in forces has been delayed until 2008. The \$11 billion has since been increased to \$13 billion. New armaments are also being introduced. The Armistice Agreement prohibits the importation of weapons from a foreign country. The U.S. deployed aircraft carriers around the Korea Peninsula to apply military pressure against us. Also a stealth aircraft carrier has appeared around the Korean Peninsula. Aircraft carriers might be more welcome in South Asia areas struck by the tsunami, but here on the Korean Peninsula it poses a threat to us and does not contribute to friendship, but hostilities. The United States is going to attack us the minute we lay down our vigilance and whenever there is an opportunity.

I have explained in detail our concerns. It has been lengthy because I tried to tell you of our concerns. We should wait and see what the policy of the second Bush team will be. We are looking for help from you to see what policy Bush will come up with.

Chairman Weldon indicated he had met with Bush Administration officials just prior to leaving on the trip and that he had met with President Bush during the election campaign and had discussed the DPRK.

If I thought the President only wants to attack your country, I wouldn't be here. I know what the President wants and I know what you want. They are very similar. It should be easy, not difficult to resolve the differences. It comes down to sequencing: who will do what first, who takes the first step. This is all subject to negotiation, which we can't do. But we can move the process forward.

Minister Kim stated his belief that the DPRK has hostile relations with the U.S.

The U.S. has designated my country an enemy state. It even has a law regarding trading with enemy states. Our relationship with Japan is also a problem. I describe relations with the U.S. with the U.S. sitting in a chair and we are kneeling on the ground and the U.S. is asking us to yield. In Asia, kneeling down is an insulting posture...only forced on a nation defeated in a war.

Chairman Weldon indicated his frustration: I hear what you say, I hear what President Bush says...you are not that far apart.

Minister Kim indicated his belief that the U.S. seeks to deny the DPRK its social system. Chairman Weldon responded by saying that he does not believe the President seeks to change DPRK's system and gave the example China -- "with whom the U.S. has

its largest trade deficit.” Libya was also mentioned as an example. “We want to help your economy and quality of life for your people, not change your system.”

Minister Kim commented that he understood the point. He further indicated his concerns about what “President Bush has said about our Leader...there is no need to repeat that.”

We will have to see what the new policy will be. There are no grounds to have confidence in the Bush Administration. Last December Ambassador Li Gun was invited to New York, but the State Department would not provide a visa. Before, I traveled to Washington on several occasions. It was difficult for me to meet with State Department officials. I had good intentions at that time. I am trying to tell you that relations among state, diplomats, and foreign officials are very strict.”

Chairman Weldon commented that post-9/11 security has created a problem for many foreign diplomats in getting visas and indicated he doesn’t support calling anyone names, “we have expressed our feelings about name calling,” and that he has the highest respect for the DPRK.

Minister Kim indicated that he had heard and understood all that had been said and expressed his confidence “in your word.” He indicated that the U.S. side had not been in contact regarding the six-party discussions, “usually they send messages through China or Japan, not directly to us. If one is to be at the talks, one should talk to all parties to the talks.

When Li Gun was denied a visa, we were told that the reason was because we were not coming to the six-party talks. When it comes to a matter of policy, the United States is blunt and even rude, in disregard of diplomatic protocols...They do not inform us of anything. They send a message to us through China or through Yabunaka of Japan...If they are interested in dialogue, they should respect the other (main) party to the talks.

Representative Engel commented that he had felt it had been an extraordinary first meeting and thanked Minister Kim for his candor: “It is important to have a frank exchange of ideas. I am here for the second time. No one forced me to be here. I want to help change the whole process... Foreign policy needs to be bipartisan. We are here in a bipartisan way to say things need to change in a positive way.”

In dinner discussion the evening of the first day, Minister Kim observed that the dignity of small nations should not be decided by large nations:

We are the ones sacrificed by large nations. In August 1945, big nations divided Korea. The Korean nation has a 5,000 year history. This historic nation was divided and has suffered as a divided nation. All nations should enjoy the same power and the same rights. The hard line policy

followed by the U.S. Administration has resulted in our Army First Policy/1st Gun Policy. We highly value the Army in our society...The China-Japan War happened in our country. We do not want our country to be the war field of other countries. We believe the U.S. can be a buffer country.

Chairman Weldon stated his concern over the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the region and that with North Korea having nuclear weapons it would be easier for Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan to justify having nuclear weapons. "Our goal is to trade with you, not fight with you."

In commenting on DPRK's nuclear program, Minister Kim indicated that the DPRK only seeks to live peacefully. However, he indicated that as time passes, the DPRK nuclear deterrent improves in quality and quantity.

"Decades ago it took 8kg of material to make a bomb, things are different now. [Our technology is not that far behind yours/We know our technology is behind.tk](differing translations). Our stuff will never get into the hands of others, which is the most serious concern to the United States. If the United States does not attack us, we will not attack the U.S. We have no intent to attack the U.S. We are a small nation and have no designs against the U.S. The main point is we believe this can all be resolved through dialogue. The U.S. should give more thought to how to coexist. The U.S. has good relations with Pakistan and India. Needless to say, Israel also. So why should this not be able to be solved for once and for all? The ten point program you put forward could help us solve this issue. I have been very candid. We have to deal with reality"

Chairman Weldon stated that both U.S. political parties had worked to reduce nuclear weapons around the world. "We no longer build nuclear weapons. We haven't done so in 30 years. We are paying Russia and Ukraine to reduce nuclear stockpiles."

Representative Upton spoke of the recent rejection by Congress of the Administration's request for funds to build a nuclear "bunker buster" and that congressional views on that issue could change very quickly if the hardliners convince Members of Congress that the DPRK is a threat.

Minister Kim raised the issue of the "bunker buster" that had previously been discussed and pointed out that such a weapon is forbidden by law, so shouldn't even be an issue -- "the U.S. is forbidden from talking about using nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states. It is wrong on moral grounds...using "bunker busters" depends on the political will of the American people. The responsibility lies with Congress." Chairman Weldon responded, "this is why time is so critically important."

Minister Kim stated that the billions spent on a new nuclear weapon could be better spent on educating children and exchange programs.

Chairman Weldon again raised the example of Libya: “Libya changed everything. Libya is not naturally a friend given its past, but it is an example of a country that now has good relations with many countries that were very recently its enemies. This was done without altering its system. Even in Iraq, the goal is to turn over the country to the Iraqis and leave.”

In commenting on the delegation’s request to meet Kim Jung Il, Minister Kim commented that:

It is not always easy to open a very big gate at the beginning. This is even more so given the tense and very hostile relations between the two nations. It is not that easy for the Foreign Minister to request such a meeting when our nations have the relations they do. Your meeting with the President is a way which opens the chance to have a meeting at a later point in the future. Even in Madam Albright’s case we were unsure whether our great general would even meet her.

General Ri, DPRK Representative to Panmunjom Mission

The delegation met with General Ri, the North Korean Representative to Panmunjom. Chairman Weldon outlined the delegation’s previous trip and the purpose of the current visit. “We come in the spirit of friendship and cooperation. We’ve been working for the past two years to achieve a resolution to the nuclear standoff that exists.”

Representative Ortiz commented that half of the delegation is of the opposition party in Congress, “but on this issue the goal of the two parties is the same -- we believe that by communicating on the issues we can arrive at solutions to better our countries and the world.”

Representative Engel indicated that the delegation was visiting for one purpose:

We want the standoff between our peoples to end peacefully and move to a positive future for our people...sometimes when we sit down across the table we find we have more in common than we might think. We believe that the nuclear standoff must be resolved. I want to stress the importance for the six-party talks to continue. I think I understand the sensitivities involved. Both countries must resolve to end the crisis. Both sides are saying the same things. We must understand the sensitivities of your side. I hope you understand our sincere desire to resolve the issues.

General Ri agreed with Chairman Weldon’s statement that the U.S. desires to respect the sovereignty of the DPRK and its system of government and intends to coexist with the DPRK. But he also noted his concerns that the U.S. doesn’t respect DPRK’s sovereignty and has no intention to coexist with the DPRK. “I can clearly remember the first Bush Administration, calling our country a member of the axis of evil. And one

country of the three countries named as part of the axis of evil has already been removed.”

He further noted the improved military capabilities in South Korea that had taken place in the past year:

I can think of F-117s, stealth bombers, new types of tanks, armored vehicles, rockets, tanks, and other new types of equipment. In one year modern equipment worth billions of dollars has been deployed. In the sea east of the DPRK there are Aegis destroyers monitoring us with state-of-the-art equipment, planning invasion of our country. In the Atlantic Ocean there are 30 nuclear submarines. In Guam there are 24 strategic bombers: B-52s and B-1s. In one year the U.S. military had 2300 flights around our country. All these are fully enough to ten times destroy our land. To summarize, we are going to wait and see what policy evolves toward the DPRK. Words are not that important, but tactical action is important. I highly appreciate your good words and feelings toward our country.

Chairman Weldon stated that he had personally discussed the DPRK with the President and assured General Ri that the President does not seek regime change, does not want to preemptively attack the DPRK, but wants to work cooperatively. “Our soldiers are like your soldiers: proud patriots, fathers, brothers that want peace. There is no reason we should make them kill one another. Peace, that is our goal.”

PAEK Nam Sun, Foreign Minister

Chairman Weldon introduced the delegation to Minister Paek and gave the background of efforts since the last visit in May-June of 2003 to educate the American people on the issues and to seek a peaceful resolution to the standoff. He indicated his frustration by the lack of progress in resolving the crisis, which precludes those in Congress from providing energy and humanitarian assistance to the DPRK and its people. He further detailed the progress that had been made with Libya in resolving issues with it that had existed for over 40 years. “Libya is no longer our enemy. We are beginning cooperation and trade and this is being done with no intent to try and remove Moammar Gaddafi from power.” Chairman Weldon repeated his comments about discussions with the President where the President indicated he does not seek regime change in North Korea and has no intent to preemptively attack North Korea -- that he looks forward to the day when the U.S. can cooperate with the DPRK and provide humanitarian assistance.

The President also told us he has great concerns with the Nuclear programs in the DPRK and wishes to peacefully resolve the outstanding issues. We think that the President’s position and the DPRK’s position are not that far apart. I think the problem is a process problem, with each side waiting to see what the other side does. I can appreciate that the DPRK does not want to jeopardize its security, embarrass its people, or bow down to

America. I understand and want to suggest ways to move this process forward -- not to negotiate, but attempt to move the process forward to resolve the crisis.

Minister Paek expressed his appreciation to the delegation for its efforts over the past 18 months in trying to resolve the nuclear issue. "We give you high praise for your past involvement and your two stage, 10 point initiative initiated by you during the last visit. Your initiative includes elements and will to resolve issues bilaterally by respecting one another and building mutual confidence of two sides. We believe your proposal is a fair one." Minister Paek noted DPRK's observation of the 60th anniversary of the Workers' Party and its liberation after World War II. He indicated that even though the DPRK is faced with difficulties and lack of materials due to economic sanctions, the people are confident of the future and work hard to achieve goals -- "the Army and people remain vigilant of the Bush military threat on our social system. You've learned from your visit that we are politically stable and our economy will get revived."

Our people are united behind our great general. Strongly united as steel, the entire people and the military are determined to preserve and protect the socialist system of our style, supporting our great leader as we enter this significant year of the 60th anniversary of the founding of the party and liberation. We uphold the "sun gun" (military first) policy...We are optimistic about our future. We are ready and determined to cope with the Bush administration's political and military action.

Minister Paek indicated he was aware of Presidential statements and those of other top American officials that the U.S. has no interest in invading or seeking regime change.

At the multilateral meeting, we expressed our intent of denuclearization. We proposed a freeze and expressed magnanimous will to accept inspections. The high level officials stated that the U.S. had no hostile intent, no plan to attack or change our regime. However their words are apart from their actions. As you are aware the Bush Administration has actually designated the DPRK a member of the axis of evil and listed the DPRK on the list for preemptive strike. The high level official often used abusive language slandering the leader of his counterpart country. The U.S. has enlarged the bill to upgrade equipment in the ROK from \$11 billion to \$13 billion, engaged in the PSI, enacted human rights legislation, and attempts to change the social system of my country. The United States insists that we reveal a HEU program that we don't have, while it is lenient on South Korea. The U.S. is winking at the South Korea nuclear issue because South Korea is a friend while it is stubborn on its position to demand the DPRK give up its so called uranium enrichment. The South Korean nuclear issue constitutes an obstacle to denuclearization of the Peninsula. If not resolved we cannot denuclearize unilaterally. Since the U.S. has pursued a policy which aims at changing the regime in my country, my country has

developed a nuclear deterrent capability to safeguard its sovereign rights. We have learned that we have strength by having a nuclear deterrent capability, like Pakistan, India, and Israel, thereby maintaining peace and preventing war. We will wait and see how the Bush Administration shapes its policies toward the DPRK and then decide on whether to return to the six-party talks. Respect must be paid to our social system. If it is true that President Bush does not intend to invade, has no hostile intent, and doesn't plan a preemptive strike and will eventually give economic aid, this kind of good intent should be put into practice. It would promote mutual understanding and trust. If only the U.S. respects our social system and sovereign rights, with genuine interest to improve relations, we can end 100 years of hostile relations. We have no desire to remain enemies. If the U.S. refrains from slandering our social system and respects our social system and doesn't talk of interfering in our internal affairs, we can respect the U.S. Nothing can be unresolved with this mutual respect...Our position to resolve (our differences) peacefully and desire to turn Korean peninsula into a nuclear free zone remains unchanged...In the current state of mutual hostility, it is a "robber-like" demand that we first lay down our arms. Our position is to lay down our arms together, at the same time. So far the United States has been asking us to first dismantle our nuclear program. They say if we do so, there will be benefits coming to us. We cannot accept this.

President Kim Yong Nam

Chairman Weldon stated that the visit had exceeded the delegation's expectations. He indicated that the delegation had worked in the past two years to support negotiations and a solution to differences between the two countries. He further stated that once the nuclear issue is resolved, Democrats and Republicans are prepared to support humanitarian efforts and trade. "We come on behalf of the American people to say the U.S. wants to be friends with the DPRK...We are here to encourage a resumption of the six-party talks. We hope you will agree to resume those talks...Time is of the essence. The longer the situation stays the way it is, the greater the chance for trouble."

President Kim responded by indicating his belief in the good will of the delegation: "with will to do so, nothing is impossible." He also commented on 2005 being the DPRK's 60th anniversary observance of the Workers' Party and its liberation after WW II. He noted that "the people of the DPRK are determined to protect our style of socialism to the last and are united around our respected general/great leader Kim Jung Il. The people are determined to build a powerful society by accelerating economic growth and following the Army First Policy...political and economic pressure is very unrealistic. We have chosen our social system and it is something that cannot be changed by any kind of pressure."

President Kim noted that 2005 is also the 5th Anniversary of the North-South Joint declaration (whereby North and South Korea agreed to (1) solve the question of the country's reunification as an independent nation, (2) settle humanitarian issues, (3)

promote balanced economic development, and (4) hold dialogues to implement agreed points.) “We have adopted a three-principle agreement with the South: (1) national independence, (2) opposition to war, and (3) independent unification for new national power.”

President Kim, in responding to Chairman Weldon’s comments regarding the need for discussions and improved relations between the two nations, also noted that this will “largely be decided upon during the shaping of the second Bush term. If the second Administration adopts policies to improve relations then we would no longer see the continuation of the 100 year war between our two countries.”

In commenting on the nuclear issue, President Kim indicated its nuclear program was an offspring of the hostile policy toward the DPRK.

Our strong nuclear deterrent is purely aimed at self defense, to cope with possible aggression from outside nations. It is purely defensive. The U.S speaks of peaceful resolution. The reality is a hostile policy, trying to change the social system we have. This is why we would like to wait and see how the second term shapes up and defines its policy toward the DPRK to see how to respond on the six-party talks. As long as the U.S. respects our sovereign rights and abandons its hostile policy aimed at regime change, we are prepared to resolve the nuclear issue and we think there is a great opportunity to resolve this issue.

President Kim also noted Chairman Weldon’s suggestion of having more Members of Congress visit the DPRK, commenting he felt it was a good idea. “It is far better to come and see my country, to see reality versus being left to rumors and speculation.”

Chairman Weldon reiterated his comments about conversations he had had with President Bush wherein the President stated that he does not seek DPRK regime change and has no intent to preemptively attack the DPRK. “In fact we have very strong trade relationships with countries that have very different social systems than your country.” He further detailed the progress that has been made in American relations with Libya.

Chairman Weldon noted his major concern that if North Korea maintains its nuclear program, then other nations in the region: Taiwan, Japan, South Korea, will want to have a nuclear capability.

This is what concerns America: The rapid spread of nuclear weapons. We want to help you do what you have said you want to do: make the Korean Peninsula nuclear free -- when conditions are right, when you feel confident that your nation will not be threatened. Our major concern is time. Time is not on our side. Some want to push the DPRK, take action. We want to avoid that. This is why we feel a sense of urgency in jump starting the six-party talks to resolve the nuclear crisis.

President Kim closed by commenting: “We should not wait for peace to come, but should achieve it.”

Khabarovsk, Russia

Chairman Yuri Onoprienko, Chairman, Regional Duma

In discussions with representatives of the regional Duma, Chairman Onoprienko outlined the activities and current issues of the region for the delegation. He indicated the climate of his region is severe, but rich in resources, beautiful, and blessed with “splendid people.”

Chairman Weldon stated his belief that the Russian Far East is the crown jewel of Russia, with the “strength of Russia lying in areas like Khabarovsk. He indicated his belief that Russia has played a significant role in assisting to bring peace to Korea and applauded President Putin in working with President Bush to bring peace to Korea. He further outlined the purpose of the delegation coming to Khabarovsk to bring focus on Russia, the region and the City of Khabarovsk -- “the Russian Far East doesn’t get enough attention from the rest of the world...Any solution to the North Korean crisis will likely involve energy from Sakhalin.”

Chairman Weldon outlined the broader goal of the delegation as helping to “jump start” the six-party talks to resolve the DPRK nuclear standoff. He expressed the appreciation of Congress for Russian involvement and President Putin’s recent statements calling for a peaceful settlement and supporting a nuclear free Korean Peninsula.

Representative Ortiz similarly expressed his appreciation for active Russian involvement in the six-party talks. He indicated he had visited Russia many times and felt that many things unite Russia and the U.S. “New technology makes the world smaller...making it incumbent to learn how to work with one another...to strengthen the bond between our two countries.

Representative Engel indicated that there are many common goals between Russia and the U.S., upon which the two countries could work together, but the most critical is the fight against international terrorism because of the threat it poses to the political, social, and economic stability of the entire world.

Representative Bartlett described the efforts of Russian Duma Deputies in ending the Kosovo conflict and indicated his belief that Russian involvement in the six-party talks will be similarly important to resolving the DPRK issue.

Representative Upton commented on his involvement in assisting in the adoption of Russian children, the importance of working together to end the “scourge of international terrorism,” Americans sharing in the grief of the Beslan tragedy, working

together to avoid nuclear proliferation, and preventing the transfer of weapons of mass destruction to international terrorists.

Representative Reyes indicated he had had an opportunity to travel to Russia a dozen times and has co-hosted Russian visitors to Washington, D.C., and invited the Duma deputies to Washington, indicating that Russia and the U.S. face many similar challenges and need to work together to achieve resolution of common problems.

Chairman Onoprienko indicated that the “democratic changes in Russia allow us to work toward common goals and share in the solving of common problems. It is our duty to unite against terrorism.”

Pavel Minaker, Economic Research Institute

The delegation met with Pavel Minaker, specialist in Asian Economic Affairs, Economic Research Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, to discuss economic issues affecting the region, with primary emphasis on Sakhalin energy resources that might benefit the entire region. Mr. Minaker indicated his belief that any agreement that would provide Sakhalin gas to Korea would be of great benefit to Khabarovsk and Vladivostok, as well. Historically, seventy percent of Russian-DPRK trade volume involves the Russian Far East. The most recent statistics indicate total trade between Russia and the DPRK was \$139 million, including deliveries of coal, joint coal development, cooperation in wood processing, fishing and fish processing, and importation of North Korean labor, principally in the wood industry.

Khabarovsk Kray/region officials attribute the principle obstacle to defense conversion as “lack of capital investment from Moscow.” Every effort is being made to capitalize on the oil and gas projects on Sakhalin. The region is working with Exxon Mobil to buy gas from Sakhalin through a pipeline which will be built from Sakhalin to the De Kastro Port in the northern part of the Kray/region.

Chairman Weldon outlined his efforts as co-chair of the Congress-Duma Study Group to improve U.S. – Russian cooperation, which includes a major emphasis on energy cooperation, noting his belief that any resolution to U.S. concerns with Iranian and DPRK nuclear programs will require major Russian involvement.

Mr. Minaker indicated his belief that the people of the region, when considering the future of the region, are more concerned about China than the DPRK.

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)

The delegation met with representatives of NGOs who described their programs and answered questions from the Members about their projects. (See attachment five.)

South Korea/Republic of Korea (ROK)

While in the ROK the delegation had separate meetings with the U.S. Ambassador and his country team; the ROK Foreign Minister; ROK Defense Minister; ROK Unification Minister; several members of the National Assembly, General Leon LaPorte, Commander of U.S. Forces Korea; and the Japanese Ambassador to Korea to discuss the North Korean visit with them. General LaPorte also provided a briefing to the delegation on the status of forces in the ROK. (See attachment two)

Beijing, China

While in the Peoples' Republic of China the delegation met with the Acting Foreign Minister, the Deputy Chairman of the National Peoples' Congress Standing Committee, and the Chinese Peoples' Institute for Foreign Affairs to discuss the North Korean visit with them. (See attachment two)

Medan, Indonesia

On January 16, the delegation flew from Beijing to Medan, Indonesia where it delivered 12,000 of relief supplies, visited with refugees and met the Indonesian and U.S. military commanders of the relief effort.

Tokyo, Japan

While in Japan the delegation had separate meetings with Ambassador Baker; the Vice Foreign Minister; the Minister of State and Chief Cabinet Secretary; and several members of the Diet to discuss the North Korean visit with them. Three members of the delegation also spoke to a conference sponsored by the Tokyo American Center and the Economic Research Institute for Northeast Asia. (See attachment two)